

The high- Q^2 HERA anomaly and supersymmetric unification

Riccardo Barbieri, Alessandro Strumia

*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pisa and
 INFN, sezione di Pisa, I-56126 Pisa, Italia*

and

Zurab Berezhiani

*INFN, sezione di Ferrara, I-44100 Ferrara, Italy and
 Institute of Physics, Georgian Academy of Sciences, Tbilisi, Georgia*

Abstract

We discuss an initial condition on the superpotential couplings of an $SU(5)$ theory which allows the R -violating term Ld^cQ but avoids the simultaneous presence of $LLe^c + d^cd^cu^c$. This same condition keeps under control the products of pairs of different couplings $\lambda_{ijk}L_id_j^cQ_k$, which are more strongly constrained by flavour-changing-neutral-current limits. In our view, this observation makes relatively more plausible the interpretation of the high- Q^2 HERA anomaly, if real, as caused by squark production.

1 It is far too early to say if the anomalous events observed by H1 and ZEUS at HERA [1] in deep-inelastic e^+p scattering are due to a statistical fluctuation or to physics beyond the Standard Model. In any event, their finding has stimulated an intensive phenomenological discussion [2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. Here we are concerned with the possible interpretation of the anomaly as caused by the production of a squark [2, 3, 4] with violation [7] of R -parity [8].

At first sight there are two problems which seem to speak, at least in our view, against this interpretation, although none of them prevents a purely phenomenological description of the data: the Flavour Changing Neutral Current problem and the consistency with supersymmetric unification. In terms of supersymmetric chiral multiplets, the relevant coupling is

$$\lambda_{ijk}L_id_j^cQ_k \quad (1)$$

where L_i , d_j^c and Q_k are superfields of lepton doublets, quark singlets and quark doublets respectively and i, j, k are generation indices. Table 1 lists the

strongest limits on products of *pairs of different couplings* of the type (1): this is the FCNC problem caused by tree level sparticle exchanges. We remind that the HERA data, interpreted as caused by $e^+d \rightarrow \tilde{u}_{Lk}$, require a *single coupling* $\lambda_{11k} \gtrsim 0.03$ [2, 3, 4].

Furthermore, as soon as one allows for R -parity or matter-parity breaking, other couplings than (1) are possible (u^c and e^c are quark and lepton singlets respectively)

$$\lambda'_{ijk}L_iL_je_k^c + \lambda''_{ijk}d_id_j^cu_k^c \quad (2)$$

with λ'_{ijk} breaking lepton number, as λ_{ijk} in (1), and λ''_{ijk} breaking baryon number. In short, the simultaneous presence of both (1) and (2) in a generic unified theory with broken matter parity, or at least in those ones that may have a chance to account for the HERA anomaly, is the other source of concern.

2 We cannot offer a neat solution for these problems. We point out, however, that there is an initial condition, or a choice of unified couplings at some large scale,

higher than the grand unified scale M_G , which gets rid of the unwanted couplings (2) and, at the same time, satisfies the strongest limits in table 1. Somehow, the flavour alignment suggested by the FCNC constraints might allow to unify the large R -violating interaction, seemingly required by the interpretation of the HERA anomaly, in a way compatible with proton decay.

We consider an SU(5) theory and we denote, as usual, by F_i , T_i , H , $\bar{H}$ the three generations of five-plets and ten-plets, and the 5 and $\bar{5}$ of Higgs-superfields respectively. We write the relevant Yukawa superpotential as

$$W = \lambda_{ij}^F(\Sigma) \bar{F}_i T_j \bar{H} + \lambda_{ij}^T(\Sigma) T_i T_j H + \lambda_{ijk}(\Sigma) \bar{F}_i \bar{F}_j T_k \quad (3)$$

where λ_{ij}^F , λ_{ij}^T and λ_{ijk} are functions of one or more superfields Σ , whose vacuum expectation values break SU(5) down to the SM gauge group at M_G . As well known, a breaking of SU(5) is required in $\lambda_{ij}^F(\langle\Sigma\rangle)$ to account for the different d-quark and charged lepton masses. As we shall see, such a breaking is also needed in λ_{ijk} . In (3), all SU(5)-contractions are left understood. $\bar{H}$ is defined as the field whose triplet component gets a heavy mass together with the triplet in H when SU(5) is broken, whereas the corresponding SU(2)-doublets remain light or, at least, have a significant component in the light Higgs doublets h_2 , h_1 .

The key assumption that we make is that the couplings $\lambda_{ij}^F(\langle\Sigma\rangle)$ and $\lambda_{ijk}(\langle\Sigma\rangle)$, for any k , are simultaneously diagonal in i, j ¹. As an illustrative example, consider an expansion of W in inverse powers of a mass scale M higher than M_G ,

$$\begin{aligned} W = & \lambda_i^{0F} \bar{F}_i T_i \bar{H} + \frac{\lambda_i^{1F}}{M} \Sigma \bar{F}_i T_i \bar{H} + \\ & + \lambda_{ij}^{0T} T_i T_j H + \frac{\lambda_{ij}^{1T}}{M} \Sigma T_i T_j H + \\ & + \frac{\lambda_{ik}}{M} \Sigma \bar{F}_i \bar{F}_j T_k + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where λ_i^{0F} , λ_i^{1F} , λ_{ij}^{0T} , λ_{ij}^{1T} and λ_{ik} are all dimensionless couplings and Σ is an SU(5)-adjoint getting a non-zero vacuum expectation value. Notice that there is no cubic term $\bar{F}_i \bar{F}_j T$ in (4), since the $\bar{5} \otimes \bar{5} \otimes 10$ SU(5)-invariant coupling is antisymmetric under interchange of the two $\bar{5}$'s.

Our simple observation is that the last term on the right-handed side of (3), or (4), below the unification scale, after $\Sigma \rightarrow \langle\Sigma\rangle$, reduces to a term proportional to

$$\lambda_{ik} L_i d_i^c Q_k \quad (5)$$

whereas the terms of the form (2) automatically vanish due to the antisymmetry of such couplings in the

¹To ensure the vanishing of (2) a weaker condition is the symmetry under $i \leftrightarrow j$ of the $\lambda_{ijk}(\langle\Sigma\rangle)$. The stronger condition here is imposed to help, at the same time, the FCNC problem.

ε_K	:	$\text{Im } \lambda_{i12} \lambda_{i21}^*$	$\lesssim 3 \cdot 10^{-11}$
Δm_K	:	$\lambda_{i12} \lambda_{i21}$	$\lesssim 5 \cdot 10^{-9}$
$\mu\text{Ti} \rightarrow e\text{Ti}$	:	$\lambda_{11k} \lambda_{21k}$	$\lesssim 2 \cdot 10^{-7}$
$\mu\text{Ti} \rightarrow e\text{Ti}$	:	$\lambda_{1j1} \lambda_{2j1}$	$\lesssim 2 \cdot 10^{-7}$
Δm_B	:	$\lambda_{i13} \lambda_{i31}$	$\lesssim 3 \cdot 10^{-7}$
$K_L \rightarrow \mu e$	:	$\lambda_{11k} \lambda_{22k}$	$\lesssim 3 \cdot 10^{-6}$

Table 1: *Limits on products of two different couplings $\lambda_{ijk} L_i d_j^c Q_k$. All bounds scale as $(m_{\tilde{f}}/200 \text{ GeV})^2$, with $m_{\tilde{f}}$ the mass of the relevant exchanged scalar.*

indices i, j . At the same time, the simultaneous diagonality of the couplings $\lambda_{ij}^F(\langle\Sigma\rangle)$ and $\lambda_{ijk}(\langle\Sigma\rangle)$ reduces to zero all the pair of couplings in table 1 except for the one relevant to $K_L \rightarrow \mu e$, which remains a product of two free parameters. We are neglecting here possible modifications of the form of the superpotential (4) due to loop corrections (see below). As we said, we cannot really claim a solution for the difficulties pointed out in the introduction. Still, the fact that one can get around them by a simple initial condition on the unified couplings may not be accidental.

3 If we neglect some small, but interesting, renormalization effects which modify the form of the superpotential (4), to be discussed below, the superpotential (4) reduces at low energy to

$$W_{\text{l.e.}} = h_2 u_c^T \lambda^u Q + h_1 d_c^T \lambda^d Q + h_1 e_c^T \lambda^e L + L_i d_c^T \lambda^{(i)} Q \quad (6)$$

where we have introduced a matrix notation in flavour space. In the same basis as (4), λ^u is an arbitrary matrix, λ^d and λ^e are both diagonal and²

$$\lambda_{jk}^{(i)} = \delta_{ij} \lambda_{ik} \quad (7)$$

For the purposes of this discussion we also assume a flavour universal initial condition for the supersymmetry breaking sfermion masses.

By going to the physical basis also for the u-quarks, the R -parity violating interaction (5) becomes

$$e_i d_c^T \lambda^{(i)} \mathbf{V}^\dagger u - \nu_i d_c^T \lambda^{(i)} d \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{V}$ is the usual Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix.

The first term in (8) is responsible for squark production at HERA. Restricting ourselves to valence quark production, all the $\tilde{u}$ -squarks are necessarily produced at HERA if kinematically accessible, via³

$$e^+ d_R \rightarrow \tilde{u}_L, \tilde{c}_L, \tilde{t}_L,$$

with effective couplings $\lambda_{11k} V_{1k}^*$, $\lambda_{11k} V_{2k}^*$ and $\lambda_{11k} V_{3k}^*$ respectively. To explain the HERA anomaly by any one

²Trivial rescaling factors are reabsorbed by proper redefinitions of the parameters.

³Here we neglect $\tilde{t}_L/\tilde{t}_R$ mixing.

of these production processes, for a $\tilde{u}$ -squark of about 200 GeV in mass, the effective coupling must be about $0.04/\sqrt{B}$ [2, 3], where B is the branching ratio for the same squark into the R -violating mode e^+u . On the other hand, the exchange of the $\tilde{u}_L$ squark gives rise to an unobserved neutrinoless $\beta\beta$ decay in Ge unless [9]

$$\left| \lambda_{11k} V_{1k}^* \left(\frac{200 \text{ GeV}}{m_{\tilde{u}_L}} \right)^2 \right| < 7 \cdot 10^{-3} \left(\frac{M_3}{1 \text{ TeV}} \right)^{1/2} \quad (9)$$

where M_3 is the gluino mass and $m_{\tilde{u}_L}$ the mass of $\tilde{u}_L$. Let us consider only one of the three couplings λ_{11k} at a time. Taking into account the values of the CKM matrix elements, to explain the HERA anomaly, λ_{111} (dominant $\tilde{u}_L$ production) is excluded, λ_{112} (dominant $\tilde{c}_L$ production) is at the border, in any case with a branching ratio B close to unity and with a $\beta\beta$ decay signal around the corner, whereas λ_{113} (dominant $\tilde{t}_L$ production) is certainly possible⁴.

4 A crucial question that we have to address is to what extent the form of the superpotential (4), which must be viewed as an initial condition valid at some large scale M , maybe close to the Planck scale or the string scale, is stable under renormalization. Since it is not, this question is actually of interest, *mutatis mutandis*, for any attempt to explain the HERA anomaly by R -parity breaking.

The main tool here is the non-renormalization theorem [10] which states that the superpotential (3), or (4), undergoes only wave-function renormalization. Notice that wave-function renormalization does produce mixing, in general, which means that the flavour structure of the superpotential (4) will not be maintained. On the other hand, wave-function renormalization cannot generate a term which is not there to start with *for any flavour structure*. This shows that terms of the form (2), possibly with an extra factor containing some component of the Σ -field, will never arise. The argument applies both to renormalization effects above and below the unification scale.

To calculate the modification of the coupling (8) both from renormalization above and below the unification scale, it is convenient to go to the basis where the Yukawa coupling matrix of the u-quarks, λ_{ij}^T in eq. (4), is diagonal. This is because we concentrate on the effects of the large top quark Yukawa coupling λ_t [11]. In this basis, above the unification scale, the three ten-plets T are rescaled by

$$T \rightarrow \text{diag}(1, 1, y_G)T \equiv Y_G T \quad (10)$$

where

$$y_G \equiv \exp \left[-3 \int_{M_G}^M \lambda_t^2(E) \frac{d \ln E}{(4\pi)^2} \right]$$

⁴Note that a stop significantly lighter than $\tilde{u}_L$, $\tilde{c}_L$ is motivated in supergravity models

so that the u-quark Yukawa coupling matrix stays diagonal and will ever remain so even below M_G . On the other hand, at M_G , the full superpotential acquires the form

$$W_G = HT^T \lambda_G^T T + \bar{H} \bar{F}^T \lambda_G^F(\Sigma) V_G^\dagger Y_G T + \bar{F}_i \bar{F} \lambda_G^{(i)}(\Sigma) V_G^\dagger Y_G T \quad (11)$$

where V_G is the unitary rotation that diagonalizes λ^u .

Just below the unification scale, W_G must be restricted to the massless fields, becoming

$$W_{\text{below } M_G} = h_2 u_c^T \lambda_G^u Q + h_1 d_c^T \lambda_G^d (V_G^\dagger Y_G) Q + h_1 L^T (\lambda_G^e V_G^\dagger Y_G) e_c + L_i d_c^T (\lambda_G^{(i)} V_G^\dagger Y_G) Q$$

From M_G to the Fermi scale, the interesting effect is the further rescaling of the Q fields

$$Q \rightarrow \text{diag}(1, 1, y_t)Q \equiv Y_t Q \quad (12)$$

with

$$y_t \equiv \exp \left[- \int_{M_Z}^{M_G} \lambda_t^2(E) \frac{d \ln E}{(4\pi)^2} \right],$$

thus reducing the superpotential at low energy to a modified form with respect to (6)

$$W_{\text{l.e.}}^{\text{true}} = h_2 u_c^T \lambda^u Q + h_1 d_c^T (\lambda_G^d V_G^\dagger Y_t Y_G) Q + h_1 L^T (\lambda_G^e V_G^\dagger Y_G) e_c + L_i d_c^T (\lambda_G^{(i)} V_G^\dagger Y_t Y_G) Q \quad (13)$$

The rescaling due to the gauge couplings, being flavour independent, does not concerns us here and can be reabsorbed in an overall redefinition of the various couplings.

To have a physical interpretation of (13), one has to go to the physical basis both for the d-quarks and for the charged leptons (the u-quark mass matrix is already diagonal). This is achieved by proper unitary rotations defined by

$$\lambda_G^e V_G^\dagger Y_G \equiv U_L^\dagger \lambda^e V_L^\dagger \quad (14a)$$

$$\lambda_G^d V_G^\dagger Y_t Y_G \equiv U^\dagger \lambda^d V^\dagger \quad (14b)$$

where λ^e and λ^d are the diagonal low-energy Yukawa couplings of the charged leptons and d-quarks respectively. In (14b), V is the CKM matrix, which justifies the use of the same notation as in (8). By going to the physical basis, the true form of the R -violating couplings, rather than (8), becomes therefore

$$e_i U_{Lij} d_c^T \lambda_{\text{true}}^{(i)} V^\dagger u - \nu_i U_{Lij} d_c^T \lambda_{\text{true}}^{(i)} d \quad (15)$$

where

$$\lambda_{\text{true}}^{(i)} = U \lambda_G^{(i)} \frac{1}{\lambda_G^d} U^\dagger \lambda^d \quad (16)$$

Notice that, except for the original $\lambda_G^{(i)}$ matrices, all other matrices in (15), (16) are known. By solving eq.s (14) at leading order in ratios of small Yukawa couplings one finds ($\lambda^d = \text{diag}(\lambda_d, \lambda_s, \lambda_b)$)

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_G^d &= \text{diag}(\lambda_d, \lambda_s, \lambda_b/y_t) \\ |U_{13}| &= |U_{31}| = (1 - y^2)(\lambda_d/\lambda_b)|V_{td}| \\ |U_{23}| &= |U_{32}| = (1 - y^2)(\lambda_s/\lambda_b)|V_{ts}| \\ |U_{12}| &= |U_{21}| = (1 - y^2)(\lambda_d/\lambda_s)|V_{td}V_{ts}^*|\end{aligned}\quad (17)$$

where $y = y_t y_G$. U_L has the same form as U , with λ^d replaced by λ^e and y by y_G .

The upshot of all this is that, even if one starts at high energy with couplings $\lambda^{(i)}$ of the form (7), small rotations occur both on the L_i -index (only due to GUT effects) and on the d_i^c . In particular, it is no longer true that the pairs of couplings occurring in table 1 (all but the one for $K_L \rightarrow \mu e$) identically vanish. Even individual lepton numbers are broken by renormalization effects above the unification scale. However, taking into account of eq. (15÷17), these flavour effects are small enough. Whatever choice is made of the index $k = 2, 3$ in λ_{11k} to explain the HERA anomaly, none of the bounds in table 1 is violated. The model passes this consistency check.

5 Nothing has been said so far on the supersymmetry breaking terms, except that the sfermion masses are taken diagonal in the basis defined by (4). If A -terms are generated by supergravity couplings [12], we assume that their flavour structure at the Planck scale is the same as in (4). As such, their discussion is analogous to the one for the superpotential itself. In particular, no baryon number violating A -term, $\tilde{d}_i^c \tilde{d}_j^c \tilde{u}_k^c$, is there to start with, nor it is generated by radiative corrections, up to terms that vanish at least as m/M_G , where m is the low energy effective supersymmetry breaking scale. Such terms will ultimately give rise to proton decay at a rate proportional to M_G^{-2} , as from a dimension-5 baryon-number violating operator [13], but with a highly suppressed numerical coefficient.

Neutrino masses also require a discussion. We assume that the μ -term and the B -term, generated after supersymmetry breaking by supergravity couplings, do not involve, as an initial condition, the fields $\bar{F}_i$, but only the light fragments of H and $\bar{H}$. The theory knows the difference between $\bar{F}_i$ and $\bar{H}$, since, by definition, it is the triplet in $\bar{H}$ which becomes heavy after SU(5)-breaking. In this situation no neutrino mass is present at the tree level. All the three neutrinos will receive mass, however, after radiative corrections. We have checked that none of them, for natural values of the parameters, exceeds the level of 1 eV.

6 In conclusion we have discussed a simple idea on the initial conditions for the superpotential couplings of an SU(5) theory which allows the R -violating terms (1) but avoids the simultaneous presence of the terms (2). This same condition makes the products of pairs of different couplings of the form (1) to vanish, which are more strongly constrained by FCNC limits. In our view, this makes relatively more plausible the interpretation of the high- Q^2 HERA anomaly, if real, as caused by squark production. We have pointed out some phenomenological consequences of our hypothesis, some of which require further study. Although possible, we do not find useful to speculate, at this time, on a symmetry origin for such initial condition at the Planck scale.

Acknowledgements We thank Francesco Vissani and Misha Vysotsky for useful discussions.

References

- [1] C. Adloff et al., H1 collaboration, *hep-ex/9702012*; J. Breitweg et al., ZEUS collaboration, *hep-ex/9702015*
- [2] D. Choudhury and S. Raychaudhuri, *hep-ph/9702392*; H. Dreiner and P. Morawitz, *hep-ph/9703279*; E. Perez, Y. Sirois and H. Dreiner, *hep-ph/9703444*; T. Kon and T. Kobayashi, *hep-ph/9704221*.
- [3] G. Altarelli, J. Ellis, G.F. Giudice, S. Lola and M.L. Mangano, *hep-ph/9703276*; J. Kalinowski, R. Rückl, H. Spiesberger and P.M. Zerwas, *hep-ph/9703288*; T. Plehn, H. Spiesberger, M. Spira and P. M. Zerwas, *hep-ph/9703433*.
- [4] K.S. Babu, C. Kolda, J. March-Russell and F. Wilczek, *hep-ph/9703299*;
- [5] J. Blümlein, *hep-ph/9703287*; M. Drees, *hep-ph/9703332*; J.L. Hewett and T.G. Rizzo, *hep-ph/9703337*; G.K. Leontaris and J.D. Vergados, *hep-ph/9703338*; Z. Kunszt and W.J. Stirling, *hep-ph/9703427*.
- [6] V. Barger, K. Cheung, K. Hagiwara and D. Zeppenfeld, *hep-ph/9703111*; M.C. Gonzales and S.F. Novaes, *hep-ph/9703346*; N. di Bartolomeo and M. Fabbrichesi, *hep-ph/9703375*.
- [7] L. Hall and M. Suzuki, *Nucl. Phys.* **B231** (1984) 419.
- [8] G. Farrar and P. Fayet, *Phys. Lett.* **B76** (1978) 575.
- [9] R. Mohapatra, *Phys. Rev.* **D34** (1986) 3457; M. Hirsch, H.V. Klapdor-Kleingrothaus and S.G. Kovalenko, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** (1995) 17 and *Phys. Rev.* **D53** (1996) 1329.
- [10] M.T. Grisaru, W. Siegel and M. Rocek, *Nucl. Phys.* **B159** (1979) 429.
- [11] L. Ibáñez, C. Lopez and C. Muñoz, *Nucl. Phys.* **B256** (1985) 218; A. Boquet, J. Kaplan and C.A. Savoy, *Nucl. Phys.* **B262** (1985) 299.
- [12] R. Barbieri, S. Ferrara and C.A. Savoy, *Phys. Lett.* **119B** (1982) 343; P. Nath, R. Arnowitt and A. Chamseddine, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49** (1982) 970.
- [13] N. Sakai and T. Yanagida, *Nucl. Phys.* **B197** (1982) 533; S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **D26** (1982) 287.